



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
FINANCE BUREAU**

1225 Fallon Street, Room 210, Oakland, CA 94612
Telephone 510-272-6749 · Fax 510-271-9125

TO: BIDDERS RECEIVING RFP NUMBER SC07/005

FROM: Superior Court of California, County of Alameda
Finance Bureau

DATE: March 23, 2007

SUBJECT/PURPOSE OF MEMO: ADDENDUM NO. 2 TO RFP NUMBER SC07/005

CONTACT FOR	Linda Salcido:	TEL:	FAX:	E-MAIL:
FURTHER	Procurement	510-272-6924	510-271-9125	<i>lsalcido@alameda.courts.ca.gov</i>
INFORMATION:	Manager			

This Addendum No. 2 is issued for the TRAFFIC SCHOOL RFP No.SC07/005, which was issued on March 5, 2007.

RFP Amendments and Clarifications:

The deadline to submit your proposals has been extended. Bid responses are due on April 17, 2007 by 2:00PM (Pacific Time).

The Court is looking for vendors to provide monthly electronic reports for the completion of the home study traffic school by its participants. This information will then be used to download into the Courts case management system (CASP). Include in your response the formats available for providing this information to Court.

Questions posed at Bidders Conference:

Q1: What format would the Court like to receive the Cost and Technical Proposals?

A1: Proposals should be submitted in writing and via CD-ROM.

Q2: Does the Court require that vendors include in their proposals the costs to the varying agencies/individuals for monitoring services?

A2: No, this cost information is not necessary.

Q3: Is the Court interested in receiving other suggestions on how reporting can be provided from the home study courses?

A3: An amendment to the RFP will be completed to include this information in the responses. The Court is interested to know whether other formats exist to obtain the certificates from the traffic schools electronically.

Q4: Please clarify Page 38, Attachment B, Subsection G. Case Reports in the RFP.

A4: The Court has reviewed the section and found that it does not apply at this time. Please disregard this section of the RFP.

Q9: With regard to 3.2.1 (b) furnishing “audited” Profit and Loss Statement and balance sheet for the last three years. By whom are you expecting the financials be audited and certified by? Our CPA firm, if they would be acceptable for the audit, tells me that this will take a minimum of 30 hrs, and possibly up to 36 hrs, at an hourly rate of \$225.00 per hour for them to complete the audit, (\$6,750.00 - \$8100.00), is this what the Court is requesting? Please clarify.

A9: The companies P&L and balance sheet statements are sufficient. The “certification” requirement means that the vendor is “certifying” that the documents submitted are a true and accurate representation of the company’s financial position.

Reminders:

Deadline for Requests for Clarifications: March 28, 2007

Deadline for Proposals: April 17, 2007, 2:00PM (Pacific Time)

Notice of Intent to Award: April 23, 2007

Notice of Award: April 24, 2007

Questions submitted via e-mail:

Q1: In Section 2.4.1 Proposal Delivery, the term “bound hard copies” is used. What exactly, is required here? Would inserting the document in a three-ring binder be appropriate, or is spiral or other binding necessary?

A1: Any type of binding used to put the material together.

Q2: What salary (or range) is currently being paid to existing contractor's traffic technicians?

A2: Existing technicians receive between \$10.50 and \$12.50 per hour.

Q3: The RFP calls for 9 technicians. How many technicians are being provided under the existing contract?

A3: There are currently 9 technicians court-wide.

Q4: Item 6 under Section 4.1.2 Technical Specifications for Traffic School Monitoring mentions health benefits, but nowhere in the RFP are other specific benefits mentioned. Does the court wish contractor to provide other benefits such as paid holidays, vacation, and sick leave?

A4: Yes, these extended benefits are currently being provided.

Q5: A review of the current contract indicates that monthly compensation is based on actual hours worked by each traffic technician at an hourly rate of no less than \$12.09 and no more than \$15.45. Does this range indicate the amount of salary paid to the traffic technicians or the amount billed to the court which covers all services?

A5: It accounts for the amount billed per technician that covers all services.

Q6: In Attachment C: Payment Provisions and Cost Proposal, Sections 1b and 1c appear to require the contractor to provide a cost figure which incorporates all costs for TVS monitoring, all costs for procurement of items for the court, and all costs for court staff (traffic technicians) somehow broken down as a figure related only to the hours worked by the traffic technicians. If this is true, why, and how can a contractor reasonably be expected to provide such a figure? These activities are mutually exclusive.

Monitoring costs are based upon the number of schools and classroom locations and remain somewhat static, regardless of the number of traffic technicians employed or other items procured for the court.

Staffing costs are directly related to the number of employees, their rate of pay, cost of benefits, and vacancies. These staffing costs can, obviously, be calculated on an hourly basis, but they can vary from month to month, and have no reasonable connection to the cost of monitoring TVS locations or procurement of items.

Without specific information as to the items to be procured pursuant to Section IV, 4.1.2, Item 4 of the RFP, the contractor is unable to provide a specific cost related to such

procurement. The cost of procurement of items is totally dependent upon the items requested, and has no connection with either staffing or monitoring costs.

Will the court consider a proposal that breaks down costs in the areas of monitoring and staffing and results in a total maximum cost per year that is not specifically related, in total, to an hourly staffing figure?

Will the court consider a proposal that specifies a percentage or other charge per transaction or request for procurement. There is no reasonable way to calculate the cost of procurement as a total or maximum per year.

A6: The cost proposals submitted should account for the expected costs necessary to run the program. The vendor will need to supply the material necessary for the Traffic Technicians to perform their duties. Cost proposals can be broken down however the vendor chooses. The vendors must ensure however, that all costs that are expected to be incurred, in association with running this program are accounted for in some manner.

Q7: With regards to the vendor furnished nine Court support employees, are they all full time, or are some to be part time?

A7: All support employees are full time.

Q8: Can you provide us with a range an entry level Clerk I is paid by your Court?

A8: Entry-level range is \$17.45 – \$20.80 per hour.

The following participants attended the Bidders Conference:

Company Name	Representative	Contact Information
National Traffic Safety Administration	Dwight Hinesley	800-539-8188 X306
		shinesley@ntsa.us
National Traffic Safety Administration	Donna Valencia	800-539-8188 X305
California Traffic Safety Institute	Norma Medlin	661-940-1907
		NMedlin@ctsi-courtnetwork.org
California Traffic Safety Institute	Michael Medlin	661-940-1907
		Mmedlin@ctsi-courtnetwork.org
California Traffic Safety Institute	Wanda Paulson	661-940-1907
		Wpaulson@ctsi-courtnetwork.org
Coordinated Court Services, Inc.	Dave Coleman	800-820-5007
		ccsdave@aol.com
Coordinated Court Services, Inc	Winson Chu	